

[20th November 1963]

MR. SPEAKER : A question cannot be based on a Newspaper report.

கனம் திரு. சே. ம. அ. மஜீத் : கனம் அங்கத்தினர் அவர்கள் கூறுவதுபோல் எந்தவிதமான தகவலும் என்னிடம் இல்லை.

Consumers' Co-operative Societies

* 352 Q.—SRI S. MADHAVAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Food be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is any proposal to open Consumer Co-operatives for Plantation and Industrial Workers; and

(b) if so, the details thereof?

THE HON. SRI N. NALLASENAPATHI SARKARAI MANRADIAR : (a) & (b) Government have sanctioned a scheme for the organisation of Consumers' Co-operative Stores for the industrial workers in this State with the co-operation of the employers. For the present, Stores will be organised in industrial establishments and plantations employing two hundred and fifty (250) or more workers. About one hundred and fifty (150) stores will be organised—one hundred (100) for industrial establishments and fifty (50) for plantations.

According to this Scheme the management concerned will give to each Store a contribution of Rupees two thousand and five hundred (Rs. 2,500) towards share capital, an interest-free loan of Rupees ten thousand (Rs. 10,000) towards Working Capital and a monthly subsidy of Rupees two hundred (Rs. 200) towards establishment charges.

The District Co-operative Supply and Marketing Societies to which the Stores will be affiliated, will make bulk purchases on behalf of the Stores and supply their requirements.

திரு. மு. பொ. வடிவேல் : புதியதாக பலநோக்கு கூட்டுறவு சங்கங்கள் திறக்கக்கூடாது என்று துணைப் பதிவாளர்களுக்கு ஏதேனும் அரசாங்கம் உத்தரவிட்டிருக்கிறதா என்று அறிய விரும்புகிறேன்.

கனம் திரு. ந. நல்லசேனாபதி சர்க்கரை மன்றாடியார் : புதியதாகத் திறக்கவேண்டும் என்பதுதான் அரசாங்கத்தின் திட்டமே தவிர, கூடாது என்று யாருக்கும் உத்தரவு அனுப்பப்படவில்லை.

Erskine Hospital

* 353 Q.—SRI S. MADHAVAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Health be pleased to state—

(a) whether some patients were affected due to administration of sub-standard medicines in the Erskine Hospital at Madurai during March 1963;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

20th November 1963]

(c) whether the Government have taken action against the firm which supplied those medicines; and

(d) if so, the details thereof?

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM : (a) No.

(b) to (d) Do not arise.

MR. SPEAKER : Questions are over.

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—POINT OF ORDER

WALK-OUT BY SOME OPPOSITION MEMBERS AFTER SPEAKER'S RULING —*cont.*

MR. SPEAKER : Hon. Members are aware of the point of order raised by the Hon. Leader of the House yesterday. The point raised was whether the walk-out staged by some Opposition Members after the Speaker had given his ruling on an adjournment motion was not tantamount to showing disrespect to the Chair and set up a bad precedent. The ruling was reserved.

Walk-out has been recognised in India as a form of Parliamentary protest. Walk-out is of various kinds. Members may walk-out silently without making any statement. They may walk-out protesting against the attitude of the Government on a certain matter or against the ruling given by the Speaker. We are now concerned with the walk-out as a protest against the ruling of the Speaker. Speaker is the custodian of the privileges of the House and also represents the dignity of the House. When he gives a ruling it must be obeyed and it should not be protested. Even if the ruling of the Speaker is wrong, the Members should obey the ruling. If they are not pleased with the ruling, they can adopt other methods prescribed in the rules. No question of protest will, therefore, arise on the Speaker's ruling. A walk-out in protest against the Speaker's ruling is surely an unbecoming way of making a protest. In the present case the walk-out was staged immediately after the Speaker gave his ruling on the adjournment motion raised by Sri V. R. Nedunchezhiyan and three others. The Leader of the Opposition stated among other things that an opportunity to discuss the matter was denied and as a protest, he was walking out. As the Speaker did not give his consent there was no opportunity to discuss the matter. So, the protest could be construed only as a protest against the ruling of the Speaker.

But yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition stated that the protest was against the attitude of the Government and not aimed at the Speaker's ruling. I accept the clarification. I am also glad that Leaders of all parties have accepted that walk-outs against the Speaker's ruling are not in order and I hope and trust that